UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/604,681	08/10/2003	Lisa Wu		1680
37754 Gmorpher Incom	7590 09/24/200 rporated	EXAMINER		
PO Box 9		NGUYEN, VAN H		
Fort Lee, NJ 07	024		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2194	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/24/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/604,681	WU, LISA	
Examiner	Art Unit	
VAN H. NGUYEN	2194	

	VAN H. NGUYEN	2194	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>28 July 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL	ICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavited al (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ai no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.13 ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in completing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
	t maioreto the doto of filina e baiof	وحالم وسفوه والمعادية	
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below 	nsideration and/or search (see NOT		cause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett	ter form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying tl	ne issues for
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reig	acted claims	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	onesponding number of finally reje	cted claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	owable if submitted in a separate, t	•	-
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: none. Claim(s) objected to: none. Claim(s) rejected: 1-33. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a).
10.	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ea.
11. X The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/VAN H NGUYEN/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 2194	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

The Specification:

Applicant does not amend the title as required (see the Office Action mailed 04/29/2009).

The Claim Objections (see the Office Action mailed 04/29/2009):

Applicant does not amend Claims 3, 6, 14, 17, 25, and 28 to overcome the Claim Objections.

The 35 USC § 112 Rejections (see the Office Action mailed 04/29/2009):

Applicant does not provide arguments regarding the 112 rejections.

Applicant does not amend Claims 1-33 to overcome the 112 rejections.

The 35 USC § 101 Rejections (see the Office Action mailed 04/29/2009):

Applicant does not provide arguments regarding the 101 rejections.

Applicant does not amend Claims 12-22 to overcome the 101 rejections.

The 35 USC § 102 Rejection (see the Office Action mailed 04/29/2009):

The response by Applicant is insufficient to satisfy the requirement of specific argument to have the claims considered for patentability; in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 Applicant must distinctly and specifically point out "how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references". Accordingly, a prima facie case of anticipation is maintained as set forth in the rejection.

Applicant is reminded that claimed subject matter, not the specification is the measure of the invention. Limitations in the specification cannot be read into the claims for the purpose of avoiding the prior art. See In re Self, 213 USPQ 1,5 (CCPA 1982); In re Priest, 199 USPQ 11, 15 (CCPA 1978).

Applicant should submit an argument under the heading "Remarks" pointing out disagreements with the examiner's contentions. Applicant must also discuss the references applied against the claims, explaining how the claims avoid the references or distinguish from them.